arXiv:1406.3512v1 [cs.CG] 13 Jun 2014

On largest volume simplices and sub-determinants

Marco Di Summa* Friedrich Eisenbrand† Yuri Faenza† Carsten Moldenhauer†

June 16, 2014

Abstract

We show that the problem of finding the simplex of largest volume in the convex hull of n points in $\mathbb{Q}^d$ can be approximated with a factor of $O(\log d)^{d/2}$ in polynomial time. This improves upon the previously best known approximation guarantee of $d^{(d-1)/2}$ by Khachiyan.

On the other hand, we show that there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that this problem cannot be approximated with a factor of c^d, unless $P = NP$. Our hardness result holds even if $n = O(d)$, in which case there exists a $\bar{c}^{\,d}$-approximation algorithm that relies on recent sampling techniques, where $\bar{c}$ is again a constant.

We show that similar results hold for the problem of finding the largest absolute value of a subdeterminant of a $d \times n$ matrix.

1 Introduction

Many techniques in convex geometry begin with approximating a geometric shape by a simpler one. The maximum volume ellipsoid, or *John ellipsoid* (see, *e.g.*, [16, 32]), for example, is a prominent such simplification with many applications in discrete and continuous optimization.

Simplices are, next to ellipsoids, among the most primitive convex sets. We are interested here in the problem of approximating a given V-polytope by a contained simplex of largest volume. More precisely, we investigate the approximability and hardness of the following problem.

> Maximum Volume Simplex (`MVS`)
>
> Given n points $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{Q}^d$, find a simplex of maximum volume that is contained in the convex hull $\text{conv}\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ of these points.

We assume here, without loss of generality, that the convex hull of the points $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is full-dimensional. As is the case for ellipsoids, the largest volume simplex in a convex body has attracted a lot of attention in the computer science and optimization literature, see, *e.g.*, [23, 13, 14, 3, 36, 37].

The volume $\text{vol}(\Sigma)$ of a full-dimensional simplex $\Sigma = \text{conv}\{v_0, v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_d\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is

$$\text{vol}(\Sigma) = \frac{|\det(A)|}{d!},$$

*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università degli Studi di Padova (Italy). `disumma@math.unipd.it`

†Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (Switzerland). `friedrich.eisenbrand@epfl.ch, yuri.faenza@epfl.ch, carsten.moldenhauer@epfl.ch`

where A is the matrix with columns $v_1 - v_0, v_2 - v_0, \ldots, v_d - v_0$. Thus MVS can be reduced to n instances of the problem of finding the largest absolute value of a $d \times d$ subdeterminant of a $d \times (n-1)$ matrix. This motivates the second problem that is central to our study.

Maximum Subdeterminant (MSD)

Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d \times n}$ of full row-rank, determine a basis $B \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ of A for which $|\det(A_B)|$ is maximum.

Here a *basis* of a $d \times n$ matrix A is a maximal subset of the column indices $B \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that the corresponding columns are linearly independent, and A_B is the matrix consisting of the columns indexed by B. Khachiyan [23] has shown that there exists a $((1+\varepsilon) \cdot d)^{(d-1)/2}$ approximation algorithm for MSD, and thus also for MVS, with running time polynomial in n, d and $1/\varepsilon$.

Our main contributions are as follows.

(i) We show that there exists an algorithm for MVS, with running time polynomial in n, d and $1/\varepsilon$, that computes a simplex Σ with

$$\mathrm{vol}(\Sigma) \cdot \Big(e \ln\big((1+\varepsilon)d\big)\Big)^{d/2} \geqslant \mathrm{Opt},$$

where Opt denotes the maximum volume of a simplex contained in $\mathrm{conv}\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$. To achieve this, we significantly tighten the analysis of Khachiyan's algorithm [23]. We also show that our analysis is essentially tight by describing instances where the approximation ratio of Khachiyan's algorithm is $(\alpha \ln(d))^{d/2}$ with $\alpha \geq 0.748$.

(ii) We show that there exists a constant $c > 1$ such that MVS cannot be approximated within a factor of c^d, unless $P = NP$. This improves the previous best 1.09-inapproximability of Packer [37].

(iii) Our hardness result (ii) holds for instances with $n = \Theta(d)$. A recent sampling technique [8] immediately yields a $\bar{c}^{\,d}$-approximation for such instances (for another constant $\bar{c}$), showing that the hardness is essentially tight in this case.

(iv) These results (i), (ii) and (iii) also hold for MSD.

1.1 Related work

The literature on topics related to MVS and MSD is extensive. In order to put our results in perspective, we provide an overview of a selection of related papers.

Approximating convex bodies

Brieden, Gritzmann and Klee [3] have shown that one can compute a simplex Σ in a convex body with $\mathrm{vol}(\Sigma)(d+1)^d \geqslant \mathrm{Opt}$ if the convex body is equipped with a weak separation oracle. This is similar to the problem of computing a maximum volume ellipsoid. Computing the John-ellipsoid is in general NP-hard, even if K is a V-polytope, *i.e.*, a polytope represented by its vertices. However, one can compute an approximation of the John-ellipsoid in polynomial time. Grötschel, Lovász and Schrijver [16] have shown that, if a convex set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is given by a

weak separation oracle, then one can compute in polynomial time an ellipsoid in K that, if scaled by a factor of roughly $d^{3/2}$, contains K. Thus there is an approximation algorithm for the problem of computing a maximum volume ellipsoid in convex sets with an approximation guarantee of $d^{3d/2}$. When K is an H-polytope (*i.e.*, a polytope described through a system of linear inequalities), then a nearly optimal algorithm is known [25].

Variants where the dimension of the solution can be restricted, *e.g.* finding a maximum volume j-dimensional simplex, have been considered for `MVS` and `MSD` [14, 3, 37, 5].

Hardness of approximation

Packer [37] has shown that `MVS` is inapproximable within a constant factor smaller than 1.09. This implies the same hardness for `MSD`, which was shown earlier to be NP-hard by Papadimitriou [38].

Koutis [26] considered the problem of finding the maximum volume j-dimensional simplex in a V-polytope. Note that one obtains problem `MVS` when $j = d$. Çivril and Magdon-Ismail [6] considered the following problem that is related to `MSD`. Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d\times n}$ and an integer j, select a subset $J \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\}$ of cardinality j such that $\sqrt{\det(A_J^T A_J)}$ is maximized. Note that one obtains problem `MSD` when $j = d$.

In both cases, the authors show that there exist a constant $c > 1$ and a function $j(d)$ such that it is NP-hard to approximate the respective problem with factor less than $c^{j(d)}$. Here, $j(d)$ is linear in d, but with constant dependence strictly less than one, thus these results do not cover the case $j = d$.

Subdeterminants in optimization and combinatorics

An integer matrix $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{d\times n}$ is *totally unimodular* if the largest absolute value Δ_k of a $k \times k$ subdeterminant of A is at most one for each $k \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. This is the case if and only if the optimum value of `MSD` is one for the matrix $(A \mid I_d)$, where I_d is the identity matrix of size $d \times d$. Seymour [41] provided a polynomial-time algorithm that tests whether a matrix is totally unimodular. *Integer programs* $\max\{c^T x \colon Ax \leqslant b, x \geqslant 0, x \in \mathbb{Z}^n\}$ defined by totally unimodular matrices $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{d\times n}$ can be solved in polynomial time. Constraint matrices with small subdeterminant also play an important role in convex (integer) optimization [20].

Subdeterminants are also fundamental in *discrepancy theory*. The *discrepancy* of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$ is defined as $\operatorname{disc}(A) = \max_{x\in\{-1,1\}^d} \|Ax\|_\infty$, see, *e.g.*, [32, 7]. The *hereditary discrepancy* of A is $\max_{S\subseteq[d]} \operatorname{disc}(A_S)$. Very recently there have been several breakthroughs in the field of approximation algorithms related to discrepancy. Bansal [1] has shown how to find a coloring that respects Spencer's bound [42]. The concept of hereditary discrepancy is closely related to *LP rounding* [29] and important in the area of approximation algorithms. Rothvoß [39] recently improved the long-standing $O((\log n)^2)$ additive error of Karmarkar and Karp [21] using techniques from discrepancy theory.

The *subdeterminant lower bound for hereditary discrepancy is* $\max_k \sqrt[k]{\Delta_k}$. Recently Matousek [33] has shown that the subdeterminant bound is tight up to a polynomial factor in $\log d$ and $\log n$. In a recent series of papers by Nikolov *et al.* [35, 34] it was shown how to approximate the hereditary discrepancy, and thus the subdeterminant bound $\max_k \sqrt[k]{\Delta_k}$, within a polynomial factor in $\log d$ and $\log n$. Our result provides a $O(\log d)$-approximation to $\sqrt[d]{\Delta_d}$. It is an interesting problem whether a polynomial time approximation algorithm for the subdeterminant bound with a guarantee that is polynomial in $\log d$ exists.

2 A tight analysis of Khachiyan's algorithm

We now come to the main algorithmic result of our paper and show the following theorem. Recall that A_B is the matrix corresponding to the columns of A indexed by B. We denote the set of bases of A by $\mathscr{B}$.

Theorem 1. *There exists an algorithm that given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d\times n}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, identifies a basis $B \subseteq \{1,\dots,n\}$ such that*

$$|\det(A_B)| \cdot \Big(e \ln\big((1+\varepsilon)d\big)\Big)^{d/2} \geqslant \max_{B'\in\mathscr{B}} |\det(A_{B'})|.$$

The algorithm runs in time polynomial in n, d, and $1/\varepsilon$. Thus MSD *and* MVS *can be approximated within the factor above.*

We first review Khachiyan's algorithm [23] for MVS and his analysis. Suppose we are given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d\times n}$ of full row rank whose columns are $a_1,\dots,a_n$ respectively. Consider the symmetric polytope

$$\mathscr{A} = \operatorname{conv}\{\pm a_1,\dots,\pm a_n\}.$$

The largest $d\times d$ subdeterminant of A, in absolute value, corresponds to the largest volume simplex in $\mathscr{A}$ with one vertex being the origin. The algorithm begins by *rounding* the polytope $\mathscr{A}$.

Khachiyan [24] showed that, if $\mathcal{K}$ is a symmetric V-polytope that is explicitly given by its vertices, then it is possible to compute an ellipsoid $\mathscr{E}$ such that $\mathscr{E} \subseteq \mathcal{K} \subseteq \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}\,\mathscr{E}$ in time polynomial in the number of vertices of $\mathcal{K}$, d and $1/\varepsilon$. This applies to the polytope $\mathscr{A}$.

The rounding step is now as follows. Compute an approximation of the ellipsoid $\mathscr{E}$ with $\mathscr{E} \subseteq \mathscr{A} \subseteq \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}\,\mathscr{E}$. Now, there exists a non-singular matrix $T \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that the image of $\mathscr{E}$ is the d-dimensional unit ball $\mathscr{B}_d$. The rounded instance of MSD is then $T\cdot A$. Clearly, this transformation is approximation preserving, since $\det((T\cdot A)_B) = \det(T)\cdot\det(A_B)$ for every basis B of A. Assume we have performed this rounding step. Then

$$\mathscr{B}_d \subseteq \mathscr{A} \subseteq \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}\,\mathscr{B}_d$$

holds. From there, the algorithm proceeds in a greedy fashion, see Figure 1.

Input: Matrix $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d\times n}$ with columns $a_1,\dots,a_n$ and $\varepsilon > 0$.

---

1. Round the instance such that $\mathscr{B}_d \subseteq \mathcal{A} \subseteq \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}\,\mathscr{B}_d$, where $\mathscr{A} = \operatorname{conv}\{\pm a_1,\dots,\pm a_n\}$ and $\mathscr{B}_d$ is the d-dimensional unit ball.
2. For $i = 1,\dots,d$:
   2.1. Pick v_i as the vector from $\{a_1,\dots,a_n\}$ with largest norm;
   2.2. Replace vectors $a_1,\dots,a_n$ with their projections onto the orthogonal complement of v_i.
3. Return the original vectors corresponding to $\{v_1,\dots,v_d\}$.

Figure 1: Khachiyan's algorithm for MSD.

Note that $v_1,\dots,v_d$ correspond to the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization of the vectors returned by the greedy procedure. Thus, after rounding, the absolute value of the determinant induced by the chosen vectors is $\|v_1\|\dots\|v_d\|$.

2.1 Khachiyan's analysis

We now review Khachiyan's analysis showing that his algorithm is a factor $((1+\varepsilon)d)^{(d-1)/2}$ approximation algorithm for MSD. Let us denote the Euclidean lengths of the picked vectors v_i by $\rho_i = \|v_i\|$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$, and define $\Delta_{\max} = \max_{B \in \mathscr{B}} |\det(A_B)|$. The claimed bound follows from the following two facts:

(i) $\rho_1^d \geqslant \Delta_{\max}$,

(ii) $\rho_i \geqslant 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, d$.

Fact (i) is the well known *Hadamard bound*, see, *e.g.*, [40], while (ii) follows from the fact that the (lower dimensional) unit ball continues to be included in the convex hull of the projection of the input vectors to a lower-dimensional space. The output of the algorithm is the subdeterminant $\Delta_{\text{out}} = \rho_1 \cdots \rho_d$. By combining (i) and (ii) with $\rho_1 \leqslant \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}$ one obtains $\Delta_{\text{out}} \cdot \left(\sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}\right)^{d-1} \geqslant \Delta_{\max}$, which is the claimed approximation ratio.

Theorem 2 (Khachiyan [23])**.** *There is a polynomial-time $((1+\varepsilon)d)^{(d-1)/2}$-approximation algorithm for problems* MSD *and* MVS*.*

2.2 Improving the analysis

We will now show that the approximation factor can in fact be bounded by $(e \ln((1+\varepsilon)d))^{d/2}$. To do so, we significantly tighten the upper bound (i) presented in the analysis above. Key to this improvement is the following observation.

Lemma 3. *Let $a_1, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the input vectors and let $v_1, \ldots, v_d$ be the picked vectors in the course of Khachiyan's algorithm, with lengths $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_d$ respectively. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be an ellipsoid with the following properties:*

(a) *Each v_i is on a principal axis of $\mathscr{E}$.*

(b) *None of the vectors v_i is contained in the interior of $\mathscr{E}$.*

(c) *There exists $\alpha > 0$ such that each a_i is contained in $\alpha \cdot \mathscr{E}$.*

Then $\Delta_{\max} \leqslant \alpha^d \rho_1 \cdots \rho_d$.

Proof. We first observe that the largest $d \times d$ subdeterminant of a matrix whose columns are in $\mathscr{E}$ is bounded by $\rho_1 \cdots \rho_d$. To see this, let p_i be an intersection point of the principal axis that includes v_i, with the boundary of $\mathscr{E}$. Since v_i is not in the interior of $\mathscr{E}$ we have $\|p_i\| \leq \rho_i$. Let T be the inverse of the matrix with columns $p_1, \ldots, p_d$. In fact, T has rows $p_1^T/\|p_1\|^2, \ldots, p_d^T/\|p_d\|^2$. The transformation $x \mapsto T\,x$ maps $\mathscr{E}$ to the unit ball $\mathscr{B}_d$. By the Hadamard bound, a selection of d vectors in $\mathscr{B}_d$ has a determinant of at most 1 in absolute value. This implies that the largest $d \times d$ subdeterminant of a matrix whose columns are in $\mathscr{E}$ is bounded by $\|p_1\| \cdots \|p_d\| \leq \rho_1 \cdots \rho_d$. Now, since $\alpha \cdot \mathscr{E}$ contains all the input vectors, we have $\Delta_{\max} \leqslant \alpha^d \rho_1 \cdots \rho_d$. □

We can now prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 1. The theorem follows from the existence of an ellipsoid $\mathscr{E}$ satisfying the conditions of Lemma 3 with $\alpha = \sqrt{e \ln((1+\varepsilon)d)}$.

The vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_d$ are pairwise orthogonal due to the projection in Step 2. Recall that determinants are invariant under rotation and note that the algorithm's execution is also invariant under rotation. Therefore, by suitably rotating the input, we can assume without loss of generality that $v_1, \ldots, v_d$ are the vectors $\rho_1 \cdot e_1, \ldots, \rho_d \cdot e_d$, where e_i is the i-th unit vector.

Next, let us *group the elements* of the decreasing sequence $\rho_1, \ldots, \rho_n$ as follows. Let G_j be the set of indices i such that $\frac{\rho_1}{\exp((j-1)/2)} \geq \rho_i > \frac{\rho_1}{\exp(j/2)}$. Let t denote the number of such groups. Since $\rho_1/\rho_d \leq \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d}$, we have $t \leq \log_{\exp(1/2)} \sqrt{(1+\varepsilon)d} = \ln((1+\varepsilon)d)$. Assume that all groups G_j are non-empty (discarding empty groups will decrease the number of groups and subsequently yield an improved analysis). Let r_j be the largest element of G_j and note that $r_j/\rho_i \leq \sqrt{e}$ for all $\rho_i \in G_j$.

Let us decompose every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ into $x = x^{(1)} + \cdots + x^{(t)}$, where $x^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is equal to x in the first $|G_1|$ components and zero otherwise, $x^{(2)}$ is equal to x in the next $|G_2|$ components and zero otherwise, and so forth. Let $\mathscr{E}$ be the ellipsoid

$$\mathscr{E} = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \left\| \frac{x^{(1)}}{r_1/\sqrt{e}} \right\|^2 + \cdots + \left\| \frac{x^{(t)}}{r_t/\sqrt{e}} \right\|^2 \leq 1 \right\}.$$

We are done once we have shown that the ellipsoid $\mathscr{E}$, together with $\alpha = \sqrt{e \ln((1+\varepsilon)d)}$, satisfies the conditions (a)–(c) from Lemma 3.

First, the principal axes of $\mathscr{E}$ are the coordinate directions $\{\lambda \cdot e_i \colon \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$, which implies (a). Second, suppose that $i \in G_j$ and recall that $v_i = \rho_i \cdot e_i$. Since $\rho_i \geq r_j/\sqrt{e}$, it follows that v_i is not in the interior of $\mathscr{E}$, which implies (b). Every input column a satisfies $\|a^{(j)}/r_j\| \leqslant 1$, otherwise the projection of a would have been picked instead of the vector corresponding to the first element of G_j. Consequently, each input column a satisfies the constraint

$$\left\| \frac{a^{(1)}}{r_1/\sqrt{e}} \right\|^2 + \cdots + \left\| \frac{a^{(t)}}{r_t/\sqrt{e}} \right\|^2 \leq e \cdot t \leq e \ln((1+\varepsilon)d),$$

which implies (c).

□

2.3 Tightness of the analysis

We now provide a family of instances of increasing dimension where Khachiyan's algorithm achieves a ratio of $(\alpha \ln(d))^{d/2}$, where $\alpha \geq 0.748$ tends to 1 as d grows. Thus, we basically match the upper bound on the approximation ratio given in the previous section.

Let $d \geqslant 4$ be a power of two. The instances are matrices with d rows of the form

$$A = \left[D \quad | \quad \tfrac{\sqrt{c^2-1}}{c} DH \quad | \quad E \right]. \tag{1}$$

Here, D is a $d \times d$ diagonal matrix of the form

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} c^{d-1} & & & \\ & c^{d-2} & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & c^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $c = d^{\frac{1}{2(d-1)}}$. Each column of D has Euclidean norm of at most $\sqrt{d}$. The matrix H is a *Hadamard* matrix, *i.e.*, $H \in \{-1, 1\}^{d \times d}$ with $|\det(H)| = d^{d/2}$ (it is well-known that such

a matrix certainly exists if d is a power of two). Also the Euclidean norm of each column of $\frac{\sqrt{c^2-1}}{c}DH$ is bounded by $\sqrt{d}$. The matrix E is such that the norm of each column is at most c and the unit ball is contained in $\mathrm{conv}(E)$. Clearly, such a matrix E exists, as $c > 1$; see, *e.g.*, [9] for explicit bounds.

Thus the polytope that is generated by the columns of the matrix (1) and their negatives is "round", in the sense that it contains the unit ball and it is contained in the unit ball scaled by $\sqrt{d}$. We will show below that Khachiyan's algorithm will output a solution of value at most $c \cdot |\det D|$. This implies the claim, as

$$\left|\det\left(\frac{\sqrt{c^2-1}}{c}DH\right)/(c\det(D))\right| = \left(\frac{c^2-1}{c^2}\right)^{d/2}\frac{d^{d/2}}{c}.$$

Then using $x - 1 \geq \ln(x)$, we deduce that the approximation ratio is

$$d^{-\frac{1}{2(d-1)}}\left(\frac{d^{1/(d-1)}-1}{d^{1/(d-1)}}d\right)^{d/2} \geq \left(d^{\frac{d-2}{d-1}-\frac{1}{d(d-1)}}\ \frac{1}{d-1}\ln(d)\right)^{d/2} \geq (\alpha\ln(d))^{d/2},$$

where α is as required.

Let w be any column vector of $\frac{\sqrt{c^2-1}}{c}DH$. The squared norm of the projection of w into the orthogonal complement of the first i column vectors of D (where $i \in \{0,\ldots,d-1\}$) is

$$\frac{c^2-1}{c^2}\sum_{j=0}^{d-i-1}c^{2j} = \frac{c^2-1}{c^2}\cdot\frac{c^{2(d-i)}-1}{c^2-1} = \frac{1}{c^2}\cdot(c^{2(d-i)}-1) < c^{2(d-i-1)}.$$

The last term is the squared norm of the $(i+1)$-th column vector of D. Thus Khachiyan's algorithm outputs the first $d-1$ columns of D, and in the last step a column of norm at most c from E. The determinant of the column vector selected by Khachiyan's algorithm is then at most $c \times |\det D|$, as claimed above.

3 Hardness

We now consider the hardness of approximating `MVS` and `MSD`. As mentioned in Section 1.1, the best inapproximability result was due to Packer [37], who proved that `MVS` cannot be approximated with a factor better than 1.09, unless $P = NP$. In this section we provide a drastic improvement showing that it is NP-hard to approximate `MVS` and `MSD` with a factor c^d, where $c > 1$ is an explicit constant. In particular, we show that the result holds for instances where $n = \Theta(d)$. We will also conclude that the hardness result is best possible for such instances.

Our argument is based on the connection between `MSD` and the following problem.

> Odd Cycle Packing (`OCP`)
>
> Given a simple undirected graph, find a maximum family of vertex-disjoint odd cycles.

In fact, given a graph G, let A_G be the node-edge incidence matrix of G. Then, for every odd cycle C of G, the square submatrix of A_G with rows corresponding to the nodes of C and columns corresponding to the edges of G has determinant ± 2. Therefore any collection

of k vertex-disjoint odd cycles in G determines a submatrix of A_G whose determinant is 2^k in absolute value. This implies that $\Delta_{\max}(A_G) \geq 2^{\mathrm{ocp}(G)}$, where $\mathrm{ocp}(G)$ denotes the optimal value of OCP on G. Conversely, all non-zero subdeterminants of A_G are powers of two (in absolute value) and indeed one can show that $\Delta_{\max}(A_G) = 2^{\mathrm{ocp}(G)}$ (see, *e.g.*, [15]).

The overall strategy for proving hardness is the following. We first build on a hardness result by Berman and Karpinski [2] on stable sets in 3-regular graphs and show that OCP is NP-Hard to approximate with a factor $\bar{c}$, where $\bar{c} > 1$ is an explicit constant. Our second step is to reduce OCP to MSD, using the construction seen above. Hence the constant inapproximability for OCP leads to a c^d-inapproximability for MSD. Last, we reduce MSD to MVS.

Let us remark that OCP is NP-hard even when restricted to planar graphs [17] and, in that case, allows for constant factor approximations [11, 27]. Following the hardness for packing the maximum number of disjoint cycles by Friggstad and Salavatipour [12], we can deduce for OCP a constant hardness under P$\neq$NP and a hardness of $O\left(\log^{\frac{1}{2}-\varepsilon} n\right)$ unless NP $\subseteq$ ZPTIME $\left(n^{\mathrm{polylog}(n)}\right)$, where n is the number of nodes of the graph. This result relies on the PCP-theorem. Our construction below yields a weaker hardness for OCP, but it does not rely on the PCP-theorem, it leads to an improved hardness result for the vertex-disjoint triangle packing problem, and it is much simpler to use for constructing a hardness for MSD subsequently. In particular, it enables us to easily calculate the explicit constants in the hardness for MSD.

On the positive side, Kawarabayashi and Reed [22] showed that for general graphs OCP can be approximated within a factor of $\sqrt{n}$.

3.1 From stable set in 3-regular graphs to OCP

We now describe our inapproximability result for OCP. We require a result of Berman and Karpinski [2] for maximum stable set on 3-regular graphs. Given a system of $2n$ linear equations modulo 2 with 3 variables per equation, Håstad [18] showed that it is NP-hard to distinguish between instances where there exists a solution satisfying $(1-\varepsilon)2n$ equations and instances where no solution satisfies more than $(1+\varepsilon)n$ equations, for any arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Building on this result, Berman and Karpinski [2] gave a polynomial time construction of a 3-regular graph on $176n$ vertices that translates n satisfied equations to a maximum stable set of size at most $97n$ and $2n$ satisfied equations to a maximum stable set of size at least $98n$. Thus, it is NP-Hard to detect if a 3-regular graph on $176n$ vertices has a stable set of size at least $(1-\varepsilon)98n$, or at most $(1+\varepsilon)97n$, for each $\varepsilon > 0$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be the graph constructed in [2]. Intuitively, we would like to construct a new graph H such that every vertex in G corresponds to a triangle in H and that a stable set in G also corresponds to a packing of triangles in H. A first candidate for such a graph H would be the line graph of G (recall that G is 3-regular), but in the line graph we might also create triangles that do not correspond to vertices in G.

We solve this issue by slightly changing G. Subdivide every edge in G twice, *i.e.*, substitute an edge $\{u, v\}$ by a path $P_{uv} = u, p_1, p_2, v$. Let G' be the obtained graph. Since G has $176n$ vertices, hence $\frac{3}{2}176n = 264n$ edges, G' has $176n + 2 \cdot 264n = 704n$ vertices and $3 \cdot 264n = 792n$ edges. Note that G' is triangle-free.

We now prove that every subdivision of an edge in G augments the stable sets by exactly one vertex. Consider a stable set S in G. By choosing p_2 when $u \in S$ or p_1 otherwise we obtain an induced stable set in G' of size $|S| + 264n$. Conversely, let S' be a stable set in G'. Modify S' such that for each P_{uv} not both u and v are in S': if both are in S', then the stable set $S' \setminus \{v\} \cup \{p_2\}$ has the same cardinality and only includes one of $\{u, v\}$. Then we can obtain a stable set in G of size at most $|S'| - 264n$. In particular, a stable set of size $97n$ (resp., $98n$) in



Figure 2: Construction of graph H (solid) from G' (dashed) and definition of H_{uv} (dotted).

G translates into a stable set of size $97n + 264n = 361n$ (resp., $362n$) in G'.

Now let H be constructed as follows: starting from the line graph of G', for each P_{uv} add two vertices and connect them as to obtain the graph H_{uv} depicted in Figure 2. The number of vertices in H is $792n+2\cdot 264n = 1320n$ and the number of edges is $\frac{1}{2}(4\cdot 792n+2\cdot 2\cdot 264n) = 2112n$, as every vertex belonging to the line graph of G' has degree four and the two additional vertices in each H_{uv} have degree two.

As G' is triangle-free, there is a one-to-one correspondence between triangles in H and vertices in G'. Moreover, two vertices in G' are adjacent if and only if their corresponding triangles in H have a common vertex. Thus a maximum stable set of size $361n$ (resp., $362n$) in G' translates into a maximum number of $361n$ (resp., $362n$) vertex-disjoint triangles in H. It is known that finding the maximum number of vertex-disjoint triangles in a graph is APX-hard [4]. However, no explicit lower bound was known.

Theorem 4. *It is NP-hard to approximate the maximum number of vertex-disjoint triangles in a graph with a factor of* $\left(\frac{362}{361} - \varepsilon\right)$ *for arbitrarily small constant* $\varepsilon > 0$*. The result holds even for graphs with maximum degree four.*

Now, consider `OCP` in H, *i.e.*, finding the maximum number of vertex-disjoint odd cycles. We prove that there is always an optimal solution consisting of triangles only. Assume the contrary, *i.e.*, the optimal solution includes a cycle C of length at least 5. We distinguish three cases. First, C does not contain any vertex other than those of type x and y (see Figure 2). Then, C must be a triangle. Second, C is fully contained in some H_{uv}. One easily checks that also in this case C must be a triangle. Third, C is not contained in any H_{uv}. Then C has to pass through the node z of some H_{uv} and hence the solution does not include any triangle in such H_{uv}. Substitute C by any of the two triangles in H_{uv} to obtain another optimal solution to `OCP`. Hence there is an optimal solution to `OCP` in H only containing triangles. Therefore we have the following hardness result.

Corollary 5. *It is NP-hard to approximate* `OCP` *with a factor of* $\left(\frac{362}{361} - \varepsilon\right)$ *for arbitrarily small constant* $\varepsilon > 0$*. The result holds even for graphs with maximum degree four.*

3.2 From `OCP` to `MSD` and `MVS`

Consider the node-edge incidence matrix A of H: this is a $1320n \times 2112n$ matrix. From what was argued above, the maximum number of vertex-disjoint odd cycles of $361n$ (resp., $362n$) translates into subdeterminants of size 2^{361n} (resp., 2^{362n}). This allows us to prove a hardness of 2^n when the dimension is $d = 1320n$.

Theorem 6. *It is NP-hard to approximate* `MSD` *with a factor of* $\left(2^{1/1320} - \varepsilon\right)^d$ *for arbitrarily small constant* $\varepsilon > 0$*. The hardness even holds when restricted to node-edge incidence matrices of graphs with maximum degree four.*

Proof. Due to the above construction of H, it is NP-hard to distinguish between the case when $\mathrm{ocp}(H) \leq (1+\varepsilon)361n$ and $\mathrm{ocp}(H) \geq (1-\varepsilon)362n$ for arbitrarily small constant $\varepsilon > 0$. Hence, for MSD on A we obtain a gap of

$$2^{(1-\varepsilon)362n-(1+\varepsilon)361n} = 2^{n(1-723\varepsilon)} = \left(2^{1-\varepsilon'}\right)^{\frac{1}{1320}d} = \left(2^{1/1320} - \varepsilon''\right)^d,$$

where $\varepsilon' = 723\varepsilon$ and $\varepsilon'' = 2^{1/1320}\left(1 - 2^{-\frac{\varepsilon'}{1320}}\right) > 0$. □

We now derive a similar inapproximability result for MVS.

Corollary 7. *It is NP-hard to approximate* MVS *with a factor of* $\left(2^{1/1320} - \varepsilon\right)^d$ *for arbitrarily small constant* $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. We show that, if we were able to solve MVS on n vectors in $\mathbb{Q}^d$ with an approximation factor $\alpha(d)$, then we would be able to solve MSD with input $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{d\times n}$ with an approximation factor of $\alpha(d) \cdot (d+1)$.[1] As we proved that MSD is inapproximable up to a factor c^d for some constant $c > 1$ unless $P = NP$, we conclude an inapproximability for MSD of $c^d/(d+1) = \Omega(\hat{c}^d)$ for any $\hat{c} < c$, unless $P = NP$.

Without loss of generality, let $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ be an optimal solution to MSD. Consider the MVS instance with input $0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$, and let S be the simplex output by the algorithm. Note that $\mathrm{conv}\{0, a_1, \ldots, a_d\}$ is a feasible solution to MVS, hence $|\det(a_1, \ldots, a_d)|/d! \leqslant \alpha(d) \cdot \mathrm{vol}(S)$. Now consider the triangulation of $\mathrm{conv}\{S, \{0\}\}$ into simplices $S_1, \ldots, S_{d+1}$ containing the origin and d of the vertices of S. We obtain

$$\mathrm{vol}(S) \leqslant \mathrm{vol}(\mathrm{conv}\{S, \{0\}\}) = \sum_{i=1}^{d+1} \mathrm{vol}(S_i) \leqslant (d+1)\,\mathrm{vol}(S'),$$

where S' is the simplex among $S_1, \ldots, S_{d+1}$ of maximum volume. Note moreover that the submatrix A' associated to the non-zero vertices of S' is a feasible solution to the original MSD problem. We deduce

$$\frac{|\det(a_1, \ldots, a_d)|}{d!} \leqslant \alpha(d) \cdot \mathrm{vol}(S) \leqslant \alpha(d) \cdot (d+1) \cdot \mathrm{vol}(S') = \alpha(d) \cdot (d+1)\frac{|\det(A')|}{d!}.$$

Hence, we can output A' and obtain the required approximation. □

Remark 1. *We remark that the construction of G' and H in Section 3.1 can be improved. In fact, we do not need to subdivide* every *edge of G twice. It is sufficient to subdivide edges so that for every vertex of G, two of its incident edges are subdivided twice. Hence, we can leave a maximum matching of G untouched. Since we can compute a maximum matching in G in polynomial time and every 3-regular graph of ℓ vertices has a matching of size $\frac{7}{16}\ell$ [19], we obtain the following slight improvements:*

For every $\varepsilon > 0$, it is NP-Hard to approximate

- *the maximum number of vertex-disjoint triangles in a graph and* OCP *within a factor of* $\left(\frac{285}{284} - \varepsilon\right)$*;*
- MSD *and* MVS *with a factor of* $\left(2^{1/1012} - \varepsilon\right)^d$.

[1] It is not difficult to prove that $d+1$ can be replaced by d. As this is not crucial for our proof, we leave the details to the interested reader.

3.3 Tightness for instances with $n = O(d)$

If the number of columns is linear in the number of rows, then a better approximation result than that of Theorem 1 is possible for `MVS` and `MSD`. The next theorem is a consequence of a recent result of Despande and Rademacher [8]. These authors have shown how to randomly sample from the set of bases of a given matrix A such that the probability of sampling a particular basis B is proportional to $\det(A_B^T A_B)$. In fact, their algorithm is more general as it can also handle k-subsets of linearly independent columns. Assume now that $n \leqslant \alpha \cdot d$ with some $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the number of bases $|\mathscr{B}_d|$ is bounded by $\binom{\alpha \cdot d}{d} \leqslant (e \cdot \alpha)^d$. We deduce

$$\mathbb{E}(|\det(A_B)|) \cdot (e\alpha)^d \geqslant \Delta_{\max}.$$

The claimed result then follows by repeated sampling and picking the largest basis.

Theorem 8. *If $n = O(d)$, then there exists a randomized algorithm for* `MSD` *with approximation ratio $\bar{c}^d$ for some constant $\bar{c}$ that depends on the constant in the O-notation.*

An alternative proof of this assertion relies on the fact that a random point in the zonotope $\{y = A \cdot x \colon 0 \leqslant x \leqslant 1\}$ can be efficiently sampled [10, 31, 28, 30]. It is folklore that a zonotope can be partitioned into parallelepipeds generated by the bases of A, *i.e.*, each parallelipiped can be mapped one-to-one to a basis. We can then identify the parallelepiped where the sampled point resides. This results in sampling each basis with a probability proportional to its determinant. We then obtain an estimation of $\mathbb{E}(|\det(A_B)|)$, as required.

References

[1] Nikhil Bansal. Constructive algorithms for discrepancy minimization. In *Proceedings of the 51st annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 3–10. IEEE, 2010.

[2] Piotr Berman and Marek Karpinski. Improved approximation lower bounds on small occurrence optimization. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity*, 10(008), 2003.

[3] Andreas Brieden, Peter Gritzmann, and Victor Klee. Oracle-polynomial-time approximation of largest simplices in convex bodies. *Discrete Mathematics*, 221(1–3):79–92, 2000.

[4] Alberto Caprara and Romeo Rizzi. Packing triangles in bounded degree graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, 84(4):175–180, 2002.

[5] Ali Çivril and Malik Magdon-Ismail. On selecting a maximum volume sub-matrix of a matrix and related problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 410(47–49):4801–4811, 2009.

[6] Ali Çivril and Malik Magdon-Ismail. Exponential inapproximability of selecting a maximum volume sub-matrix. *Algorithmica*, 65:159–176, 2013.

[7] Bernard Chazelle. *The discrepancy method: randomness and complexity.* Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[8] Amit Deshpande and Luis Rademacher. Efficient volume sampling for row/column subset selection. In *Proceedings of the 51st annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 329–338, 2010.

[9] R.M. Dudley. Metric entropy of some classes of sets with differentiable boundaries. *Journal of Approximation Theory*, 10:227–236, 1974.

[10] Martin Dyer, Alan Frieze, and Ravi Kannan. A random polynomial-time algorithm for approximating the volume of convex bodies. *Journal of the ACM*, 38(1):1–17, 1991.

[11] Samuel Fiorini, Nadia Hardy, Bruce Reed, and Adrian Vetta. Approximate min-max relations for odd cycles in planar graphs. *Mathematical Programming*, 110(1, Ser. B):71–91, 2007.

[12] Zachary Friggstad and Mohammad R. Salavatipour. Approximability of packing disjoint cycles. *Algorithmica*, 60(2):395–400, 2011.

[13] Peter Gritzmann and Victor Klee. On the complexity of some basic problems in computational convexity. I. Containment problems. *Discrete Mathematics*, 136(1-3):129–174, 1994.

[14] Peter Gritzmann, Victor Klee, and David Larman. Largest j-simplices in n-polytopes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 13(3-4):477–515, 1995.

[15] Jerrold W. Grossman, Devadatta M. Kulkarni, and Irwin E. Schochetman. On the minors of an incidence matrix and its Smith normal form. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 218:213–224, 1995.

[16] Martin Grötschel, László Lovász, and Alexander Schrijver. *Geometric Algorithms and Combinatorial Optimization*, volume 2 of *Algorithms and Combinatorics*. Springer, 1988.

[17] Nadia Hardy. Odd cycles in planar graphs. Master's thesis, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, 2005.

[18] Johan Håstad. Some optimal inapproximability results. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(4):798–859, 2001.

[19] Arthur M. Hobbs and Edward Schmeichel. On the maximum number of independent edges in cubic graphs. *Discrete Mathematics*, 42(2–3):317–320, 1982.

[20] Dorit S. Hochbaum and J. George Shanthikumar. Convex separable optimization is not much harder than linear optimization. *Journal of the ACM*, 37(4):843–862, 1990.

[21] Narendra Karmarkar and Richard M. Karp. An efficient approximation scheme for the one-dimensional binpacking problem. In *Proceedings of the 23rd annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 312–320, 1982.

[22] Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi and Bruce Reed. Odd cycle packing. In *Proceedings of the 42nd annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 695–704. ACM, 2010.

[23] Leonid G. Khachiyan. On the complexity of approximating extremal determinants in matrices. *Journal of Complexity*, 11(1):138–153, 1995.

[24] Leonid G. Khachiyan. Rounding of polytopes in the real number model of computation. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 21(2):307–320, 1996.

[25] Leonid G. Khachiyan and Michael J. Todd. On the complexity of approximating the maximal inscribed ellipsoid for a polytope. *Mathematical Programming*, 61(2, Ser. A):137–159, 1993.

[26] Ioannis Koutis. Parameterized complexity and improved inapproximability for computing the largest j-simplex in a V-polytope. *Information Processing Letters*, 100(1):8–13, 2006.

[27] Daniel Král', Jean-Sébastien Sereni, and Ladislav Stacho. Min-max relations for odd cycles in planar graphs. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 26(3):884–895, 2012.

[28] László Lovász and Miklós Simonovits. Random walks in a convex body and an improved volume algorithm. *Random structures & algorithms*, 4(4):359–412, 1993.

[29] László Lovász, Joel Spencer, and Katalin Vesztergombi. Discrepancy of set-systems and matrices. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 7(2):151–160, 1986.

[30] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Hit-and-run from a corner. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(4):985–1005, 2006.

[31] László Lovász and Santosh Vempala. Simulated annealing in convex bodies and an $O^*(n^4)$ volume algorithm. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(2):392–417, 2006.

[32] Jiří Matoušek. *Lectures on discrete geometry*, volume 212 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002.

[33] Jiří Matoušek. The determinant bound for discrepancy is almost tight. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 141(2):451–460, 2013.

[34] Aleksandar Nikolov and Kunal Talwar. Approximating hereditary discrepancy via small width ellipsoids. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.6204*, 2013.

[35] Aleksandar Nikolov, Kunal Talwar, and Li Zhang. The geometry of differential privacy: the sparse and approximate cases. In *Proceedings of the 45th annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2013.

[36] Asa Packer. NP-hardness of largest contained and smallest containing simplices for V- and H-polytopes. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 28(3):349–377, 2002.

[37] Asa Packer. Polynomial-time approximation of largest simplices in V-polytopes. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 134(1-3):213–237, 2004.

[38] Christos H. Papadimitriou. The largest subdeterminant of a matrix. *Bulletin of the Greek Mathematical Society*, 25:95–105, 1984.

[39] Thomas Rothvoß. Approximating bin packing within O(log OPT* log log OPT) bins. In *Proceedings of the 54th annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 20–29. IEEE, 2013.

[40] Alexander Schrijver. *Theory of Linear and Integer Programming*. Wiley-Interscience Series In Discrete Mathematics And Optimization, 1998.

[41] Paul D. Seymour. Decomposition of regular matroids. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory. Series B*, 28(3):305–359, 1980.

[42] Joel Spencer. Six standard deviations suffice. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 289(2):679–706, 1985.